



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/539,789 | 04/03/2006 | Steffen Pfeiffer | 4385-051182 | 5011 |
| 28289 | 7590 | 12/03/2008 | | |
| THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. | | | EXAMINER | |
| 700 KOPPERS BUILDING | | | LISTVOYB, GREGORY | |
| 436 SEVENTH AVENUE | | | | |
| PITTSBURGH, PA 15219 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1796 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/03/2008 | PAPER |
| | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. 10/539,789 | Applicant(s) PFEIFFER ET AL. |
| | Examiner GREGORY LISTVOYB | Art Unit 1796 |

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 25-34 and 37-48

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached *Information Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

*/Rabon Sergent/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796*

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The Amendment of Claim 25, which claims the range of the precondensate at the first vaporization step significantly changes the scope of the claim ,thus, requiring new consideration and search, .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. Applicant argues that "Borner et al. does not teach a) a transesterification process and b) a two step vaporization process for concentrating the etherified melamine resin precondensate up to a concentration of 99 wt%, as presently claimed" Examiner disagrees. First, two step process claimed only in the presently amended claims. For the reason described above the amendments are not entered by Examiner. Regarding precondensate concentration, as cited in the previous Office Action that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to obtain 95-99% solids in Borner et al.'s process in order to make the extrusion procedure more effective. In addition, a low amount of aggressive volatiles does not create any safety, corrosion and health issues during the above step of the process. 2. The same arguments are applicable to Adams et al 3.Regarding Horacek, Applicant argues that the Reference uses very strong - toluene sulfonic acid, which leads to uncontrollable molecular weight. This is incorrect. First, amount of the acid is very low (0.1-1%) (see Column 3, line 10). Second, Horacek does not exclude another acidic catalyst, stating that "usual catalysts can be added". Applicant argues that Horacek uses melamine to formaldehyde ratio of 1 to (5- 6), whereas Applicant uses ratio of 1 to (2-4). However, Horacek is a secondary reference, which modifies Borner providing exhibits low shrinkage during curing and good mechanical properties (high flexibility).